



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,066	12/22/2004	Elmo Marcus Attila Diederiks	NL 020628	7327

24737 7590 04/30/2008

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

PARK, EDWARD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/30/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/519,066

Applicant(s)

DIEDERIKS ET AL.

Examiner

EDWARD PARK

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-856)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/10/08 has been entered.

Claim Objections - 37 CFR 1.75(a)

2. The following is a quotation of 37 CFR 1.75(a):

The specification must conclude with a claim particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery.

3. **Claims 4, 9, 10** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a), as failing to conform to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as his invention or discovery.

Regarding **claims 4, 9, 10**, the phrase, "closer to the presentation device", is interpreted broadly as possible. What is the scope of the phrase, "closer to the presentation device"? Is a light source 2 feet away in "closer to the presentation device" or 50 feet "closer to the presentation device"? The broadest interpretation will be utilized for examination purposes. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claims 4, 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim calls for the element “at least one ambient light source comprises at least two ambient light sources”. One ordinary skill in the art would interpret this claim limitation as having two ambient light sources. Is there a separate light source? Which light source is the first light source? The scope of protection is unclear, and the claim is therefore indefinite. The examiner will interpret the claim limitation as reasonably broad as possible. The interpretation of the claim limitation is having more than one ambient light source. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. **Claims 1, 4-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lys et al (US 6,166,496).

Regarding **claim 1**, Lys teaches a method of controlling at least one ambient light source, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a video signal by a receiver (Lys: fig. 85; col. 49, lines 32-40, numeral 518 decoder 518 that is capable of decoding an incoming signal); presenting the video signal by a presentation device (Lys: fig. 85, numeral 561 television/entertainment device); characterized in that the method further comprises the steps of: analyzing the video signal to determine video properties of an image formed by the video signal; (Lys: fig. 85, col. 47, line 60 – col. 49, line 8, microprocessor processes certain portions of the bandwidth of television signal for signals relating to the room lights); and setting a property of ambient light generated by said at least one ambient light source based upon the determined video properties (Lys: fig. 85, col. 47, line 60 – col. 49, line 8, color and intensity of room lights may be directly controlled through certain portions of the bandwidth of television signal).

Regarding **claim 4**, Lys teaches at least two ambient light sources, and wherein the method comprises setting the property of the ambient light generated by the ambient light source of the at least two ambient light sources that is closer to the presentation device (Lys: fig. 85, numeral 501; col. 50, lines 22-28 control data can be any data generator capable of generating data for controlling the illumination sources 501).

Regarding **claim 5**, Lys teaches setting the property of the ambient light is substantially synchronous with presentation of the video signal by the presentation device (Lys: col. 48, lines 1-26).

Regarding **claim 6**, Lys teaches setting the property of the ambient light is configurable (Lys: col. 48, lines 1-26).

Regarding **claim 7**, Lys teaches setting the property of the ambient light is configurable by a user preference (Lys: col. 13, lines 6-23).

Regarding **claim 8**, Lys teaches a system for controlling at least one ambient light source, the system comprising:

receiving means for receiving a video signal (Lys: fig. 85; col. 49, lines 32-40, numeral 518 decoder 518 that is capable of decoding an incoming signal); translation means for translating the video signal into a displayable signal by a presentation device (Lys: fig. 85, numeral 561 television/entertainment device), characterized in that the system further comprises: processing means for analyzing the received video signal to determine video properties of an image formed by the video signal (Lys: fig. 85, col. 47, line 60 – col. 49, line 8, microprocessor processes certain portions of the bandwidth of television signal for signals relating to the room lights), and for setting a property of ambient light generated by the at least one ambient light source based upon the determined video properties (Lys: fig. 85, col. 47, line 60 – col. 49, line 8, color and intensity of room lights may be directly controlled through certain portions of the bandwidth of television signal).

Regarding **claim 9**, Lys teaches at least two ambient light sources, and wherein the processing means sets the property of the ambient light of the ambient light source of the at least two ambient light sources that is closer to the presentation device (Lys: fig. 85, numeral 501).

Regarding **claim 10**, Lys teaches synchronization means for synchronizing the presentation of the display signal on the presentation device with setting the property of the

ambient light generated by the ambient light source that is closer to the presentation device (Lys: col. 48, lines 1-26).

Regarding **claim 11**, Lys teaches a lighting unit comprising a light armature (Lys: figure 85, numeral 501) and the system as claimed in claim 8 (see rejection of claim 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 2, 3** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Lys et al (US 6,166,496) in view of Ludwig (US 6,689,947 B2).

Regarding **claims 2, 3**, Lys discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 1. Lys does not disclose face recognition and facial expression recognition.

Ludwig teaches face recognition and facial expression recognition (see col. 32, lines 1-9 recognition of human facial expressions from video images have allowed the ability for the human face to be used as a controller for lighting).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Lys reference to utilize face recognition and facial expression recognition as taught by Ludwig, to enhance the dynamics and functionality of the lightening system by providing a deeper integration of visual environment.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 3/10/08, in regards to **claims 1 and 8** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the Lys reference does not teach the claim limitation "analyzing the video signal to determine video properties of an image formed by the video signal". This argument is not considered persuasive since the video signal is considered to be the feed being decoded by the decoder that comprises both the images (video) and the lighting control data. Applicant agrees that the decoder separates and analyzes the video signal through the decoder 518. The newly added claim limitation of "an image formed by" does not overcome the prior art since a video signal inherently has images and therefore will generate ("form") an image. Examiner notes that the claim limitation does not explicitly state that the image is analyzed to determine video properties.

Furthermore, applicant argues that the Lys reference does not teach "setting a property of ambient light generated by the at least on ambient light source based upon the determined video properties". This argument is not considered persuasive since the Lys reference does meet the limitation in Lys: fig. 85, col. 47, line 60 – col. 49, line 8, color and intensity of room lights may be directly controlled through certain portions of the bandwidth of television signal.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDWARD PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-1576. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30 - 20:00, (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vikkram Bali can be reached on (571) 272-7415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Edward Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

/Edward Park/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Vikkram Bali/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624